THEOLOGY

VOL. LVIII AUGUST, 1955 No. 422

Editorial

IT is no use any longer trying to conceal the fact that Q is under fire. Q is the hypothetical documentary source of the material in the Gospels of St Matthew and St Luke that is common to them both and was not derived from St Mark. There have always been unresolved difficulties in the way of accepting this hypothesis, but it came to be regarded as so much more probable an explanation of the facts of the case than any alternative hypothesis that generations of students have been led to suppose that the existence of such a lost document was virtually established. The existence of Q has so long been a commonplace of the theological lecture room, of learned treatises and of popular text-books that, if it should be mortally wounded, its demise would not easily be accepted. The credit of too many professors, lecturers and authors is at stake. It is too soon yet to say whether mortal wounds are being inflicted, for it is easier to see the weaknesses of the Q-hypothesis than the cogency of any other. But the time has come at least to underline the hypothetical character of what has never been more than a hypothetical document and to emphasize that the probability of its existence must still be regarded as an open question. The latest burst of fire and perhaps the most formidable reopening of the question is Dr Austin Farrer's essay "On Dispensing with Q" in the exciting volume of *Studies in the Gospels*, edited by Professor D. E. Nineham.[1] We will not attempt to summarize or discuss Dr Farrer's arguments, but we would urge that his essay be read not only with a willingness to reckon faithfully with the objections to the Q-hypothesis but also with an equally critical attitude to Dr Farrer's own hypothesis, which is that St Luke, when he wrote, had St Matthew's Gospel before him.

Studies in the Gospels is a volume of essays that was originally planned as a tribute to the late Dr R. H. Lightfoot from a group of his former pupils, but in the event they were joined by other scholars who also wished to express admiration for his work. The editor contributes a revealing memoir of Dr Lightfoot, and the twelve essays that follow are not only on a high level of scholarship but illustrate fresh lines of thought in research upon the Gospels to which Dr Lightfoot's own influence gave a powerful impetus. This is indeed a volume which can be strongly recommended to anyone who wants to sample the critical and constructive work that is being done by contemporary N.T. scholars. While not all of it is so challenging to accepted opinions as Dr Farrer's essay on Q, it does, taken as a whole, show how much new light may yet break upon the Church's understanding of the Gospels as a result of continued study.

[1] Basil Blackwell, 30s.

For instance, Mr C. F. Evans in his essay suggests that the central section of St Luke's Gospel (9. 51 to 18. 14) was deliberately designed to correspond with the Book of Deuteronomy and so to imply that our Lord was "the prophet like unto Moses", for the same reason that St Matthew's Gospel is so constructed as to contain five books of a Christian Pentateuch. Mr J. C. Fenton in an essay on "Paul and Mark" gives a new turn to the old question of the Paulinism of St Mark's Gospel by showing how the meaning of his Gospel is illuminated by the themes of St Paul's Epistles. Mr C. P. M. Jones claims to establish that there is a striking kinship between the Epistle to the Hebrews and the writings of St Luke, and that in Luke-Hebrews we have a type of New Testament theology clearly distinguishable from that of St Paul or St John. Professor Nineham submits to a searching criticism Dr C. H. Dodd's contention (first advanced in the *Expository Times* in 1932) that St Mark's Gospel supplies us with a reliable historical framework for our Lord's ministry. This contention has been repeated by other scholars, but different arguments will have to be found for it if dependence is to be placed upon it in future. Professor Sparks examines "The Doctrine of the Divine Fatherhood", and shows how different it is from what is popularly imagined.

The other essays in this most rewarding volume are as follows: "The Septuagintal Background to the New Testament use of *δόξα*" by Mr. L. H. Brockington (this should be read in conjunction with the Bishop of Durham's book on *The Glory of God, etc.*); "The Appearances of the Risen Christ: an Essay in Form-Criticism of the Gospels" by Dr C. H. Dodd; "The Gentile Mission in Mark and Mark 13. 9–11" by Professor G. D. Kilpatrick; "The Holy Spirit in the Writings of St Luke" by Professor G. W. H. Lampe; "Sacrament and Common Meal" by Professor D. M. MacKinnon; and "Realized Eschatology and the Messianic Secret" by Professor T. W. Manson. It is inexcusable that a volume to which students will frequently want to refer has not been given an index.

* * * * *

We extend a cordial welcome to the *Canadian Journal of Theology: a Quarterly of Christian Thought*.[1] It promises to maintain a balance of interest between national and general theological developments. Thus the first number, which appeared last April, contains articles on "The Present Position and Future Prospects of Canadian Theology" and "The Study of Canadian Church History" as well as on "Is Preaching Prophecy?" and "Agape and Eros: a critique of Nygren". While the standard of scholarship is high, the material is presented in a manner that should appeal to laymen. Professor R. Bultmann is going to write in a future number on "The Transformation of the Idea of the Church in the History of Early Christianity".

[1] $3.00 per annum from 75 Queen's Park Crescent, Toronto 5, Canada.

The Sacrifice of Praise[1]

THE CHURCH'S THANKSGIVING IN N.T. TIMES

And one cried to another and said: Holy, Holy, Holy is the Lord of hosts: the whole earth is full of his glory (Isaiah 6. 3).

At the heart of the Eucharist, in all the traditional rites of Christendom, stands the song of the Seraphim, the hymn of God's glory—Holy, Holy, Holy is the Lord of hosts. It has stood there from time immemorial. No doubt the first explicit evidence for its inclusion in the Eucharistic Prayer is to be found in the fourth century—in the Catecheses of St Cyril of Jerusalem (XXIII, 6). But there are references in earlier writers, either to the chant itself, or to the living creatures who sing it, which make it probable that its inclusion was widespread in the second century. In Egypt Clement of Alexandria (*Stromateis* VII, 12), in Africa Tertullian (*De Oratione Dominica* III), and in Gaul St Irenaeus (*Demonstration of the Apostolic Preaching* X) all apparently allude to its use. It is indeed lacking from the Eucharistic Prayer in the Apostolic Tradition of St Hippolytus as we now have it, as well as from the Prayers in the Acts of John. But there is good reason to suppose that it once stood in the Prayer which St Hippolytus actually wrote, of which the version we now have is almost certainly abbreviated and interpolated. (See E. C. Ratcliff, "The Sanctus and the Pattern of the Early Anaphora", *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, vol. i, Nos. 1 and 2.) And, in view of the character of the Acts of John, one would scarcely expect to find an Old Testament text in their Prayers. Nor is evidence lacking that the Sanctus was in use in the first century. St Clement of Rome (1 Clement XXXIV, 6) quotes the text in an obviously liturgical combination with the angelic hosts of the seventh chapter of Daniel. And it appears again, in a liturgical form, and with the same association with Daniel, in the fourth and fifth chapters of the Apocalypse (Rev. 4. 8; cf. 5. 11). It might therefore plausibly be claimed that the Sanctus belongs to the earliest stratum of Christian worship that we know of, and is one of the oldest ingredients in the Eucharistic liturgy.

The association of the Sanctus with the Eucharist is so widespread, and of such long standing, that we take it for granted. Yet it is difficult at first sight to see any logical connexion between the two. What the Lord said and did at the Supper we shall never know. But the Apostolic Church thought that he intended his actions to be repeated (1 Cor. 11. 24, 25), and claimed that they were repeated as a proclamation of his death in the past, and as an anticipation of his coming in glory in the future (1 Cor. 11. 26; Mark 14. 25; Luke 22. 16, 18). Now there is nothing in the proclamation of the Lord's death which suggests the Seraphim and the heavenly worship. Some connexion might perhaps be found between the angelic hosts and the coming of the Lord in glory, especially if that coming be associated with the Judgment (Matt. 13. 41; 16. 27; Luke 12. 8, 9). But there is

[1] A sermon preached before the University of Cambridge on 24 April 1955.

little to link such a coming immediately with the adoring song of the Seraphim and the worship of the hosts of heaven. Yet the association of the Sanctus with the Eucharist must have been made by the first generation of Christians, if it was well established by the time of St Clement and of the author of the Apocalypse.

It seems possible that it was the interpretation of the Lord's death as the sacrifice of the New Covenant which was responsible for this otherwise inexplicable connexion. It may be that the Lord himself used at the Supper the phrase "the New Covenant in my blood" (1 Cor. 11. 25). It is probable that St Mark embodied in his Gospel a traditional narrative which had already changed the phrase to "This is my blood of the Covenant" (Mark 14. 24), in order to assimilate it to the words ascribed to Moses in Exodus 24 (v. 8). It is certain that the author of Hebrews has misquoted the text in Exodus in order to make it square with the phrase in Mark (Heb. 9. 20; Mark 14. 24). The interpretation of the Supper and the Passion in terms of the Covenant Sacrifice therefore is deeply rooted in the New Testament. And it is the story of the making of the Old Covenant, when applied to the Supper and to its imitation in the Eucharist, which seems to lead—indirectly—to the introduction of the Seraphim and the Sanctus into the Eucharistic Prayer.

The scene as set in Exodus (19 and 24) for the giving of the Law and the making of the Covenant is well known. "There were thunders and lightnings, and a thick cloud upon the mount, and the voice of a trumpet exceeding loud" (19. 16). "And Mount Sinai was altogether on smoke, because the Lord descended upon it in fire, and the smoke thereof ascended as the smoke of a furnace, and the whole mount quaked greatly" (19. 18). When the Commandments have been given, the Covenant is made. Moses "rose up early in the morning, and builded an altar under the mount, and twelve pillars according to the tribes of the children of Israel. And he sent young men of the children of Israel, which offered burnt offerings and sacrificed peace offerings unto the Lord. And Moses took half of the blood and put it in basons, and half of the blood he sprinkled on the altar. . . . And Moses took the blood, and sprinkled it on the people and said, 'Behold the blood of the Covenant, which the Lord hath made with you upon all these conditions.' Then went up Moses and Aaron, Nadab and Abihu, and seventy of the elders of Israel: and they saw the God of Israel: and there was under his feet as it were a paved work of sapphire stone, and as it were the very heaven for clearness. And upon the nobles of the children of Israel he laid not his hand; and they beheld God, and did eat and drink" (24. 4–11).

The earliest Christians—with or without the Lord's explicit authority—interpreted the Supper and the Passion in terms of the making of the Old Covenant. Inevitably therefore they were led to interpret the Eucharist against the same background. For the Eucharist is at once the imitation of the Supper and the proclamation of the Passion. Now the making of the Old Covenant involved not merely the slaughter of victims, and the outpouring of their blood, and the sprinkling of the Covenant People and of the Law. It also

involved a "coming up unto the Lord" (Exodus 24. 1) on the part of the elders of Israel as well as on the part of Moses, the mediator of the Old Covenant. They went up, they saw God, and did not perish at the sight; they saw God, and did eat and drink (Exodus 24. 9–11). So the making of the New Covenant was apparently thought to involve, not merely the slaughter of the Victim, and the outpouring of his blood, and the sprinkling of that blood upon the Covenant People, as Peter, Paul, John and Hebrews in their various ways assert (1 Pet. 1. 2; 1 Cor. 10. 16; 11. 25; 1 John 1. 7; Heb. 10. 19). It also involved a "coming up unto the Lord"—not now of the elders of Israel, but of the whole People of God—a vision of God's glory, and an act of eating and drinking in his presence. Such a view of the Eucharist would be congenial to those who thought of the Lord's Person largely in terms of the Son of Man in the seventh chapter of Daniel. For there the Son of Man, who is also the Saints of the Most High, comes "with the clouds of heaven", and comes "even to the Ancient of Days, and they brought him near before him" (Dan. 7. 18). And it is significant that in the earliest references to the Sanctus, in the Apocalypse and in 1 Clement, our text from Isaiah 6 appears in the setting of Daniel 7.

The point seems admirably taken in the Epistle to the Hebrews, where the writer reminds his audience of the heavenly reality of their worship (Heb. 12. 18–24). Christians are not come "unto a mount that might be touched, and that burned with fire, and unto blackness, and darkness, and the sound of a trumpet"; they are not come in fact unto the mount of the Old Covenant. But they "are come unto Mount Zion, and unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and to ten thousands of angels in festal array, and to the church of the first-born who are enrolled in heaven, and to the Judge, the God of all, and to the spirits of just men made perfect, and to Jesus, the mediator of a new covenant, and to a blood of sprinkling that speaketh better things than that of Abel". Christians are the new Covenant People. In their worship they do not go back to the arrangements of the Old Covenant, whether at Sinai or elsewhere. But they are come to heaven itself, to the place where God hath chosen to place his Name (Deut. 12. 5), to the true Mount Zion, the heavenly Jerusalem. There, upon the clouds of heaven, they meet with the ten thousand times ten thousand who stand before the Ancient of Days (Dan. 7. 10). There they encounter the church of the first-born who have prevailed to escape the judgment, and to stand before the Son of Man (Luke 21. 36). There they find the eternal God himself, and Jesus the mediator. bearing in his hands the blood of the New and Eternal Covenant, which at once cries to God for mercy and sprinkles the inward parts of God's People. There they receive a kingdom that cannot be shaken, and must therefore have thankfulness, whereby they may offer divine service that is well pleasing to God (Heb. 11. 28; cf. Dan. 2. 44; 7. 14, 22).

The worship of the New Covenant is pictured by the writer to the Hebrews as taking place in heaven itself. In this passage it is depicted as the true Zion, to which the New Israel is come up; elsewhere as

the Holy of Holies, into which the true High Priest is entered in the power of his own blood (Heb. 9. 12), and into which the Priestly Nation is now admitted (Heb. 10. 19–21). But in either case the scene is laid in heaven. And the same worship is pictured in the same setting in the Apocalypse, chapters 4 and 5. The vision is connected with Eucharistic worship. "I was in the spirit on the Lord's day" (Rev. 1. 10). The Lord's day was distinguished from other days only by the celebration of the Lord's Eucharist. The vision is connected with the worship of heaven. "I looked and behold, a door opened in heaven" (Rev. 4. 1). And there the scene is set as in Hebrews chapter 12. There is the Judge, the God of all, "one sitting upon the throne; and he that sat was to look upon like a jasper stone and a sardius" (v. 3). There is the church of the first-born assembled for worship; "round about the throne were four and twenty thrones" (v. 4) for the Royal Priesthood. "And upon the thrones I saw four and twenty elders sitting, arrayed in white garments" (v. 4). There are the ten thousands of angels in festal array, "and the number of them was ten thousand times ten thousand, and thousands of thousands" (5. 11). And there is Jesus, the mediator of the New Covenant; "I saw in the midst of the throne and of the four living creatures and in the midst of the elders a Lamb" (5. 6). Nor is the blood of sprinkling absent from the picture. For the Lamb is "as it had been slain"; and the great multitude who stand before the throne and before the Lamb in chapter 7 have "washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb" (7. 9, 14).

The setting of Christian worship and the persons engaged in it are described in similar terms in Apocalypse and in Hebrews. In Hebrews there is no indication of the subject-matter of the Christian Eucharist beyond the fact that it is a sacrifice of praise offered through Christ to the Father, and involves a confessing to God's Name (Heb. 13. 15). But when we turn to the Apocalypse the case is different. The four living ceatures, as the leaders of the heavenly choir, sing without ceasing the Sanctus, confessing to the Name of Jehovah Sabaoth. But it is significant that they sing it, not in the text of the Septuagint, but in the text of the later liturgies—not "Holy, Holy, Holy is the Lord of hosts", but "Holy, Holy, Holy is the Lord, the *God* of hosts". When however the four and twenty elders join in the heavenly worship, they do not limit themselves to joining in the Sanctus of the living creatures. They utter a series of thanksgivings, in which we may discern the pattern of the Eucharistic Prayer, as alluded to by second-century writers.

It is well known that St Justin, both in the Apology and in the Dialogue, alludes to the content of the celebrant's Prayer at the Eucharist. The fullest mention is to be found in the Dialogue (XLI), where we read that the Eucharist is offered "in order that we may at the same time give thanks to God both for the creation of the world, with all things therein, for man's sake, and also for the deliverance of us men from the evil, in which we were born, and for the complete overthrow of the principalities and powers, through becoming capable of suffering according to God's counsel". Here we have a

definite reference to the topics of Creation and Redemption, which it is reasonable to suppose were extemporized upon by the second-century celebrant. When we turn back to Apocalypse 4 and 5, we meet with the same topics in the thanksgivings uttered by the four and twenty elders, in response to the worship of the angels. "Worthy art thou, our Lord and our God, to receive the glory and the honour and the power: for thou didst create all things, and because of thy will they were, and were created" (4. 11). Here we have the topic of Creation as the opening theme of the Thanksgiving of the elders. In the following chapter, after the appearance of the Lamb, the elders continue their Thanksgiving with the topic of Redemption. "Worthy art thou to take the book and to open the seals thereof: for thou wast slain, and didst purchase unto God with thy blood men of every tribe and tongue and people and nation" (5. 9).

But there are other allusions in St Justin, which suggests that Creation and Redemption were only two of the topics which the celebrants of his day had inherited from the first century. In the Apology (LXV) we read that the celebrant over the oblation "sends up praise and glory to the Father of all through the name of the Son and of the Holy Spirit" and further "makes thanksgiving at length for being made worthy of these things from him". What "these things" are is suggested by the Dialogue (CXVII), where we read that prayers and thanksgivings are the only type of sacrifice which is pleasing to God, and that these must be offered by those who are worthy. Since God receives sacrifice from no one save from his priests, as we have just read in the preceding chapter, it appears to follow that those who are worthy to offer the sacrifice of thanksgiving must be those who are God's priests. A third topic therefore extemporized upon by St Justin's celebrant, besides thanksgiving for Creation and Redemption, may well have been thanksgiving for the priesthood of the Church. Turning back to Apocalypse 5, we find that this is the third topic of the Thanksgiving of the elders. Not only do they give thanks that "thou hast created all things", not only that "thou wast slain and didst purchase men unto God with thy blood", but also that thou "madest them to be unto our God a kingdom and priests" (5. 10). In this connexion we may note that in the Prayer contained in the present version of the Apostolic Tradition of St Hippolytus, the topics of thanksgiving are the same. After a suspiciously short thanksgiving for Creation, and an extended thanksgiving for Redemption, the final thanksgiving runs—"giving thanks to thee because thou hast accounted us *worthy* to stand before thee and *to minister unto thee as priests*".

St Justin, in alluding to thanksgiving for being accounted worthy, may well be referring to a third topic in the traditional Prayer—a thanksgiving for the Priesthood of the People of God. But to what is he referring when he alludes to the "praise and glory to the Father of all, through the name of the Son and of the Holy Spirit"? I would suggest that here we have a reference to the Sanctus, sung by the Son and the Spirit to the glory of the Father, echoed both by the angelic hosts and by the Church in heaven and on earth. It is notorious that

in certain fourth-century liturgical texts the Son and the Spirit are depicted as the leaders of the heavenly choir, who sing the hymn of God's glory; that in the third century the Cherubim above the mercy-seat and the Seraphim of Isaiah's vision were similarly interpreted by Origen; that in the second century St Irenaeus apparently regarded the Cherubim and the Seraphim, who glorify God with unceasing voices, as the Son and the Spirit; and his reference makes it clear that they glorify God by singing the Sanctus. (Cf. Armitage Robinson, St Irenaeus, *The Demonstration of the Apostolic Preaching*, London, 1920, pp. 38 ff., for references.) St Justin's celebrant therefore, when he sent up praise and glory to the Father of all, through the name of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, may reasonably be taken to have included in his Prayer the Cherubim and the Seraphim, and the Sanctus that they sing. And as we turn back once more to Apocalypse 5, we find that the elders conclude their performance with a similar ascription of glory. For after they have uttered thanksgiving to God for the Creation of all things (4. 11), and for the Redemption of mankind (5. 9), and for the Royal Priesthood of the Church (5. 10), they join with the angels of Daniel's vision (5. 10), and with all things created in heaven and in earth (5. 13), in giving God the glory. Neither here, nor in chapter 4, is the full text of the Sanctus given. But the key words of the second clause are included here, as the text of the first clause is included there. And the four living creatures, who have uttered the first half of the Sanctus in chapter 4, signify their assent to the *glory* given by *heaven* and *earth* in chapter 5, by singing the Amen to the Eucharist of the Church (5. 14).

The study of Eucharistic origins and of early Eucharistic forms can never be pursued satisfactorily either by Biblical scholars or by liturgists alone. For the liturgical tradition, which the liturgist studies, inevitably stems from the Old Testament, and is presupposed by the New. Each type of scholar, as he invades the field of the other, is liable to make many mistakes. But that is the only way in which progress can ever be made. Nor can this study—in the Church of England, at any rate—be ever purely academic. For the revision of the Eucharistic liturgy cannot be indefinitely postponed: and it is imperative that, when it is undertaken, it should be the work of the Biblical scholars and the liturgists, and not of the ecclesiastical politicians.

The purpose of the Eucharistic Prayer is to unite the Holy People of God in giving thanks to God the Father, as the Lord himself gave thanks the night before he suffered. There can be no reasonable doubt that from the beginning it consisted of thanksgiving offered to God through Christ. We have tried to suggest the topics for which the Apostolic Church gave thanks—the Creation of the World, the Redemption of Mankind, the Sanctification of the Priestly People of God. These were the three articles of faith into which all Christians were once for all baptized; and it is not surprising if they recalled them with thanksgiving Sunday by Sunday over the Bread and Cup. It is much to be wished that in any revision of the Communion

Service the great Prayer of Thanksgiving should be restored. Whatever divisions there may be among Christians within the National Church, the doctrines of Creation, of Redemption and of Sanctification are common ground to all. Equipped with such a Prayer, we should be enabled to stand before God united, and to minister unto him as priests, by offering the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, and by confessing to the Name of God with angels and archangels and with all the company of heaven.

A. H. Couratin.

Faith in the Healing Miracles of the Synoptic Gospels

It is generally supposed that faith was present as a pre-requisite in the miracles of healing which the Gospels record. Mention of faith is, as a matter of fact, absent from many of our Lord's miracles. It is, however, often noted and almost as frequently implied. The supposition is not therefore unreasonable.

The nature of the faith assumed to be present in those who come to be healed or in those who bring them is usually such as may be described under such adjectives as "subjective", "personal", even "emotional". The patient or his friends are aware of some stirring of a feeling of personal trust in the healer and without this feeling, it is assumed, the miracle would not take place. The cure is effected only and inasmuch as the suppliant can or does personally commit himself to the healer, as though the suppliant by his own faith assisted in his own cure.

On the face of it, some of our Lord's words and actions seem to support this subjective assumption. "Thy faith hath made thee whole", "As thou hast believed, so be it done unto thee", may seem to move all the responsibility for the cure from Jesus on to the suppliant and to put a premium upon the depth of his faith. It is often supposed too that such actions as anointing eyes with spittle, taking by the hand or leading aside were psychological gambits designed to encourage this personal trust in Jesus as a healer. They display, it is said, the psychological insight which our Lord showed in his dealing with the sick and which helped to make possible some of his faith cures.

It is but a short step from the subjective to the psychological, and such an interpretation of the healing miracles is often employed today with a view to obtaining results or at least setting up the right conditions for healing in what is now known as faith healing. The deepening of this kind of faith is often treated as a necessary preliminary even to spiritual healing.

Under whatever scientific or theological cover this assumption about the meaning of faith is made, the assumption reveals an approach to the New Testament which is still questing after the historical Jesus. Faith in this connexion means the vague, emotionally tinged, almost psychological, personal committal of the suppliant to the

healer. Such an understanding of the healing miracles could probably not have been arrived at earlier than the thirteenth century. It is certainly far removed from the matter-of-fact and credulous age of the Gospel writers. Indeed we are being very latitudinarian: such an assumption is probably no older than Wordsworth or the later German Pietists.

Clearly, however, some quality of faith on the part of the suppliant was, if not an absolute prerequisite, a very important concomitant of the majority of our Lord's acts of healing. Considering such words as "Thy faith hath made thee whole", or "He could do there no mighty work because of their unbelief", we cannot refuse to believe that the suppliant's faith contributed at least in part to the performing or the possibility of the performance of the healing. The question at issue is: what are we to understand by "faith"?

Even if we persist in the historical approach it must be obvious that many of those who came to our Lord for healing were possessed of a very jejune faith. They came simply because they had heard that Jesus could heal. Perhaps we may feel this to be true in particular of some who came on behalf of others: yet it is often these whose faith is most warmly commended.

I proceed to discuss in detail two of the healing miracles of Jesus in order to try to elucidate the character of the faith involved. But first I will restate the now well observed fact that the devils which are cast out by Jesus invariably recognize him for who he is and that in their recognition and acknowledgement of Jesus as the Messiah they accept, and perhaps encompass, their own destruction. I wish to contend that it is a similar recognition of the Messiah, or at least of his attributes, which releases Christ's healing power; and that this recognition only, according to the Gospel narrative, is the content of the faith of those who are healed.

The incidents of the giving of sight to Bartimaeus (Mark 10. 46–52) and the restoring of the daughter of the Syrophoenician woman (Mark 7. 24–30) have a common literary feature which is unusual in the healing narratives of the gospels. There is conveyed in either case an element of doubt as to whether the desired healing is going to be effected. In the case of Bartimaeus the doubt and impression of delay is occasioned by the hostility of the crowd set against the persistence of Bartimaeus' cry. In the story of the Syrophoenician's daughter it is the apparent unwillingness of Jesus to heal which holds up the narrative. In the first case, Jesus' friends and followers begin by refusing for him and their attitude is reversed by Jesus' own action: in the second, Jesus himself appears to refuse and then to change his attitude. In both cases the impression of doubt conveyed by the narrative gives place to a reversal of the situation and a notable healing.

The two stories have, then, a common literary feature which makes them noteworthy. They also have a common theological theme: they are both stories of persistent faith.

They are not, of course, the only healing narratives in which delay and persistent faith are encountered. In Mark, for instance, the paralytic and Jaïrus' daughter spring at once to mind. But in neither

story does the element of doubt about Jesus' willingness to heal present itself as it does in these two stories. They may therefore furnish us with material peculiarly relevant to our inquiry.

In the giving of sight to Bartimaeus it is assumed by the crowds that Jesus will not want to heal the man. They are, in fact, mistaken, very much mistaken. Why did Jesus stop and insist on the man's being brought to him in spite of the attitude of his followers? It is rather limp and pathetic to suggest, particularly at this climacteric point of the narrative, that he wished to reward the beggar's persistence. On an objective literary view the key to the story would appear to be in the repeated use of the title "Son of David". It is not surprising that this agrees with the thematic or theological understanding of the section in which the story occurs. In Mark the story is the concluding term of a theme on discipleship which begins after the account of John Baptist's death (ch. 6) and which grows particularly strong from 10. 17 (the narrative of the man with great possessions who wished to follow Jesus). The theme, however, is not simply one of discipleship. The theme of discipleship is bound into the greater theme of this part of the Gospel: the recognition of the true character of Messiah. Jesus is presented in passion and in glory, in transfiguration and in forthcoming disfigurement. First his forthcoming death is prefigured in the death of John Baptist. Then we see him as the dispenser of life to Jew and Gentile in the feedings of the multitude. Then comes the crux at Caesarea Philippi, where the two truths of Messiah's character are united, followed by the Transfiguration and the last two predictions of the Passion. Throughout this period the disciples continually fail to understand both the meaning of Jesus' Messiahship and therefore also the character of their own discipleship. Peter's error embodied in his great statement at Caesarea Philippi finds a complement in the mistaken request of the sons of Zebedee, which immediately precedes the story of Bartimaeus.

The theme then is the growing recognition by the disciple of the real character of Messiah and his work, and the consequent growth of the disciple into true discipleship. Jesus is Son of Man and Suffering Servant, and he who would follow must also take up a cross.

The two incidents concerning blindness in the section are used by St Mark as a commentary to point the theme. The blind man of Bethsaida who was healed in two stages immediately before the journey to Caesarea Philippi is a reflection of the yet half understanding disciples who will, in due course, "see all things clearly". Bartimaeus, encountered on the last stage of the journey to the Passion, "received his sight, and followed him in the way".

The theme of true discipleship is concluded on this note. The overriding theme of the true character of Messiah and his work does not, however, come to an end here. It continues to the end of the Gospel, and the same words which conclude the lesser theme ("followed in the way") move the story on to the next presentation of the greater: the triumphal entry of the Davidic King into his city. The concluding words of this section, "Blessed is the kingdom that cometh of our father David", not only point the typology of this act of Messiah, if

that were needed, but also reflect Bartimaeus' repeated acclamation of Jesus, "Thou son of David."

Bartimaeus, the type (or reflection if the word is over-used) of the true disciple, is such because he recognizes the true Messiah and gives him his appropriate title. He who has perceived receives his sight, and he becomes such a type in the Gospel story just because he perceives and receives his sight. We may not ask what Bartimaeus meant in historical fact by "Thou son of David", for the Gospel does not tell us. It tells us that the historical fact was that Bartimaeus called Jesus by his appropriate Messianic title and that, contrary to the expectation of some, he received his sight as a result. We can but conclude that the faith which Jesus says has made him whole is the direct acknowledgement of the person of the Messiah. This conclusion is utterly corroborated by the place which the story has in the theme pattern of the evangelist.

In Matthew the parallel narrative bears exactly the same interpretation as in Mark. In Luke, although the story bears out precisely the conclusion that sight was given in response to direct acceptance of the person of Messiah, the story has a different place in the evangelist's plan. It is secondary to the story of Zacchaeus, to which it forms an introduction. The pattern of the theme again corroborates, for the theme of the story of Zacchaeus is that "Zacchaeus, though an outcast to the murmurers, is yet one of God's people" (Creed). Both stories belong to the theme of the true acceptance of the Christ.

The story of the exorcism of the Syrophoenician woman's daughter in Mark contains no mention of faith, nor is Jesus addressed under any Messianic title. There is a commendation of the woman in verse 29, "For this saying, go thy way . . ." and this commendation is placed at just the point where we might have expected some mention of her faith, had such been included.

We are, of course, bound to ask the question, "Why did Jesus change his mind?" as we read this story. Certainly at first he seems to refuse to heal the child, saying that the children must first be filled and it is not meet to take their bread and give it to the dogs. The woman replies that the dogs nevertheless eat of the children's crumbs. Then, "for this saying", Jesus apparently changes his mind and heals the child. It would be patronizing of us to suppose that Jesus consented to heal the child simply because the woman's response was clever or ingratiating, although this supposition is frequently made. It is also almost certainly an over-simplification of the words "for this saying"; and it is more than likely that the evangelist does not expect us to read in his narrative any suggestion that Jesus did change his mind.

The story clearly concerns the theme of the admission of the Gentiles to the Church and in particular to the Eucharist—the woman is a Gentile both by race and religion—and in it the attitude of Jesus is quite clearly and consistently stated. His mission is first to the Jews, but he cannot refuse to exercise his Messianic powers towards those Gentiles who accept his authority.

Jesus does in fact give the woman every opportunity of accepting

his authority. The dogs are specifically referred to as "house dogs", pets which have their place in the family life. The woman is quick to seize on this and points out that they do in fact share the family food. In saying this, the woman claims a position in the household and thus implies acceptance of the authority of the master of the household, whom she addresses as "Lord". (*Κύριος* has not here the full theological content that it has elsewhere in Mark, but it is difficult to believe that it is intended here as a mere courtesy title: it is at least a term implying deep respect.) Jesus, on his part now accepts her and in the act of exercising his authority draws her and her child within the household of salvation.

The story is a story of faith. "For this saying", which we have already noted as occurring where we might have expected a commendation of faith, is indeed just such a commendation. But because the story concerns a Gentile it is not specifically told in terms of the acceptance by faith of the person of Messiah, as is the story of Bartimaeus. Nevertheless, told as it were in Gentile terms, such is exactly the point of the story. If confirmation of this were needed, we have only to refer to Matt. 15. 21–28. The changes which Matthew makes in adapting the Marcan account reflect faithfully his deeper insistence that the mission of Messiah was to the Jews. Christ was the Messiah of God's people and all who accept him worship in fact "the God of Israel" (15. 31). The story gives nevertheless further dominical attestation to the right of believing Gentiles to admission to the life and fellowship of the Church, and it does so perhaps more evidently and more forcefully than does St Mark's account.

The changes which Matthew makes are, however, particularly relevant to our consideration. The Messianic title "Lord, son of David", is put on the lips of the woman as she makes her request; and in place of the words "for this saying" is substituted "O woman, great is thy faith". If at some points Matthew misses the deeper import of Mark's narrative, he certainly does not here.

If the above is a correct understanding of this story, the character of the faith exhibited leaves little room for the subjective, personal view of faith as generally assumed to-day. The woman's faith is direct and objective: it is not even a faith in Christ's power and in no sense can it be equated with the idea of personal trust. It is a faith in the authority of Christ in his supreme right. It is an acceptance of his person and character as the Messiah of God.

It may be doubted whether any of the miracles of healing as they are recorded in the Gospel narratives lend credence to the contemporary subjective view of faith. It could not be more clear from such passages as the account of the messengers sent by John Baptist from prison, that the healings of the Gospel are in fact declarations of the Gospel, the peculiar work of the prophet-foretold Messiah, and it is therefore a *prima facie* assumption that the faith involved in such healings is a direct acceptance of the proffered revelation of God in his Messiah and Son. This is the context in which every one of the Gospel healings is set, and it is a notion far removed from that of a personal trust in a powerful healer. The kind of faith required in the

healings is the same as that which Christ demanded when he first came preaching and saying, "The time is fulfilled . . . the kingdom is at hand . . . believe in the gospel." Jesus' own coming is itself the Gospel which he preaches. Recognition of this is faith: failure to recognize it is unbelief. It was this unbelief which prevented the accomplishment of any mighty work at Nazareth, though even there he was not left altogether without witnesses. Again, it is doubt and delay in recognizing Christ's character, office and work, just revealed to the three on the Mount of Transfiguration, that delays the healing of the boy with the dumb spirit (Mark 9. 14–29). Matthew brings out more clearly than Mark that the inability of the disciples to cure the boy is due to their failure to recognize their part with Messiah. The "Q" story of the healing of the centurion's servant more clearly than that of the Canaanitish woman presents faith as an acceptance of Christ's authority, and that most intimate of healing stories, the woman with the issue of blood, immediately loses any such personal significance when Jesus insists upon publishing the action and when the woman's faith is contrasted by the evangelist with the unbelief of those who laughed in the face of Jesus before he performed one of the mightiest of his Messianic works.

The healings without faith may now be seen to be as important as those where faith is commented on. Healing is the prerogative of God's mercy and a sign of his kingdom. This prerogative Messiah exercises, whose coming itself brings in the kingdom. It may be a parallel assumption, though it is nowhere made explicit in the gospels, that the faith which is found in those who are healed is itself the gift of God. How derogatory to the divine Christ of the Gospel are many of our contemporary assumptions about the character of faith!

If this is a true understanding of the faith displayed in the healing miracles, certain guidance for our own ministry of healing may be derived. First, the humanist approach must be ruthlessly excised. We, while ourselves remaining human in our approach to the sick, must try to set them in direct contact with Christ in his true character. This may not be easy after a lifetime of unbelief or misrepresentation. Psychology and subjective faith attempt to limit the suffering soul within human experience and give it human comfort. In critical illness this is of little use. The sign that the soul has come to face Christ in his true character may well be genuine penitence. If this has been achieved, the patient will be ready to accept healing, or the withholding of healing, equally as from the hand of God.

Secondly, in ministering healing, we minister the divine action of God. We must therefore be ourselves moved, guided and directed by the Holy Spirit, especially in our particular ministry of the laying on of hands and Holy Unction. An indiscriminate use of this ministry is not compatible with the Gospel pattern of faith and healing. Laying on of hands and Holy Unction should perhaps be used only where faith, in the Gospel sense, is present.

Last, it is to be remembered that our ministry of healing may be ineffective because we ourselves, like the disciples beneath the Mount

of Transfiguration, may not yet have understood or accepted our part with Messiah in his ministry. The faith of the disciple is perhaps more costly and demanding than that of the patient.

ALAN SHAW.

The Sermons of Archbishop Tillotson

"HE was not only the best Preacher of the age, but seemed to have brought Preaching to perfection. His Sermons were so well heard and liked, and so much read, that all the Nation proposed him as a Pattern, and studied to copy after him."[1] Gilbert Burnet's appreciation of John Tillotson as a preacher was coloured indeed by the warmth of personal friendship; yet it erred little on the side of exaggeration in its estimate of contemporary evaluation of his sermons. During his own time indeed Tillotson became the model of the Anglican pulpit; and his preaching undoubtedly popularized a new technique and style, as well as exhibiting at its most characteristic the content, of contemporary sermons. He cannot be denied his place in any anthology of great Anglican preachers; and it is worth while to inquire the nature of that vogue of preaching of which he was at once the exemplar and leader.

Historically the new type of sermon represented a strong reaction both against the "metaphysical" discourse of the earlier half of the seventeenth century, of which Donne and Andrewes had been the principal protagonists, and against the Puritan preaching, the exponents of which during the Interregnum had been legion. Against the verbal conceits, the involved sentences, the rich imagery, and the wealth of classical learning, which had been characteristic of the sermons of Andrewes, a strong reaction had set in; and therewith a demand for a simpler homiletic style. Nor had the extemporaneous and "enthusiastic" utterances of the Puritans domesticated themselves in the Anglican pulpit. Tillotson exactly fulfilled and epitomized the new conception of the office of preacher. As Canon Smyth has observed: "The triumph of Tillotson meant the emancipation of the Anglican pulpit not only from the metaphysical but also from the Puritan tradition. It involved a breach, not only with the homiletic conventions of the middle ages, but also with the homiletic conventions of the immediate past. On the one hand, Tillotson abandoned the use of *exempla*; on the other, he rejected the almost mechanical iteration of cant terms and phrases; for both alike he substituted the appeal to reason and to common sense, the careful, comprehensive argument, solid, unhurried, unadorned. From the one, he rejected the stiff, formal pedantry which for centuries had governed the development of the preacher's theme; from the other, he rejected the illimitable divisions and subdivisions, the 'applications' and the 'resolutions', which marked the Scriptural sermons of the Presbyterian divines."[2]

---

[1] G. Burnet: *History of My Own Times*, Book V: Anno 1694.
[2] Charles Smyth: *The Art of Preaching*, p. 146.

Of the popularity of Tillotson's sermons there can be no doubt. His weekly lecture on Tuesdays at St Lawrence Jury in the City of London was attended not only by "a numerous audience brought together from the remotest parts of the metropolis", but also by "a great concourse of the clergy, who came thither to form their minds".[1] Even more striking was the circulation of his printed sermons; of which six octavo volumes of collected discourses and twenty-eight separate sermons were published during his lifetime; and after his death the straitened circumstances of his widow were relieved by the payment by Richard Chiswell of 2,500 guineas for the manuscript of his sermons, the highest price as yet paid for the manuscript of an English book.[2] Examples still continue to come to light of the ubiquitous adaptation of his sermons by country incumbents in different parts of England, as shown by the instances of Parson Woodforde in Somerset and Norfolk and Anthony Hastwell in the North Riding of Yorkshire.[3] The essayists Addison and Steele regarded Tillotson not only as a model preacher but as an authoritative theologian; and Swift, in warning young clergymen against quoting "Dr Tillotson and other famous divines" without recollecting "the difference between elaborate discourses upon important occasions, delivered to princes or parliaments, written with a view to being made public, and a plain sermon intended for the middle or lower sort of people", added the just observation that the "excellent prelate above-mentioned was known to preach after a much more popular manner in the city congregations".[4] Thus the vogue of Tillotson's sermons was not exaggerated by his friend Bishop Burnet.

Perhaps the first characteristic of Tillotson's preaching style was its simplicity of diction. "Proper words in proper places, make the true definition of a style", observed Jonathan Swift, himself both critic and exponent. Tillotson's style conformed well to this simple yet sufficient standard, having a marked paucity of metaphor and imagery, being characterized by great clarity and order, and employing as the unit of its prose the simple, not the complex, sentence. Moreover, his sermons were built upon the foundation of a careful scheme, taking the form of a tripartite plan. First, the text in its context was explained; secondly, came the exposition of a series of propositions arising from it; and finally, the application to the particular congregation addressed. By this means he "built his sermons in so precise and obvious a manner that he was the admiration of his own day, and of the generation that followed. His arrangement is without flaw. Divisions are named, points under each are numbered, objections presented and answered, first, secondly, and thirdly."[5]

[1] T. Birch: *Life of Tillotson*, p. 28.

[2] The *Tatler*, No. 101. Cf. *The Life and Errors of John Dunton*, p. 280.

[3] N. Sykes: "The Sermons of a Country Parson", THEOLOGY, February and May 1939; E. W. Watson: "An Eighteenth Century Clergyman," in the *Church Quarterly Review*, January 1928.

[4] J. Swift: "A Letter to a Young Clergyman": *Prose Works of Swift*, edited by T. Scott, iii, 203.

[5] C. Richardson: *English Preachers and Preaching: 1640–70*, p. 73.

The weakness of Tillotson in this respect lay in a tendency to over-elaboration and to multiplication of the subdivisions and points of his discourse. But the majority of his sermons display a clear and simple structure which gives them great formal strength. "Within this simple framework", Canon Smyth has commented, "the development, though closely argued, is entirely flexible and free. The one point of criticism in point of style is that the different divisions of the sermon are sometimes disproportionate in length, and that the sub-headings, particularly in the earlier sermons, are too many and too complex in their variations and their combinations. But there are no digressions or irrelevancies; the sermon is a piece of close and careful argument; and the plan of the argument is always borne in mind."[1] The disproportion between the several sections is particularly marked in that devoted to explanation of the text. In striking contrast to the earlier pattern, of which Donne and Andrewes are examples, by which each word of the text is twisted and harried to wring every possible meaning, Tillotson often seems to have chosen his text as an appendage to his theme, rather than made his sermon an elaborate exposition of his text.

In fact it is the subject-matter of his sermons which chiefly accounted for their popularity in his own age and their neglect by succeeding generations. All his preaching was built on the twin foundations of the authority of the Bible and the reality of natural religion. Upon the latter basis alone, conviction could be reached of the existence of God, the immortality of the soul, and a future state of rewards and punishments. It was the function of the revelation recorded in the Bible to support, buttress, and extend these fundamental truths of natural religion. Tillotson's sermons therefore are studded with Biblical quotations and references, since the Bible was the sole and supreme authority for Christian belief. But reason must be the judge of the credentials and credibility of the Biblical revelation; and nothing could be believed which contradicted the testimony of human reason and of natural religion. Revelation indeed might add truths and doctrines which the unaided human reason could not have found by searching out; but it must not contradict such findings.

"Unless the knowledge of God and his essential perfections be natural, I do not see what sufficient and certain foundation there can be of revealed religion. For unless we naturally know God to be a Being of all perfection, and consequently that whatever he says is true, I cannot see what divine revelation can signify. For God's revealing or declaring such a thing to us, is no necessary argument that it is so, unless antecedently to this revelation we be possess'd firmly with this principle, that whatever God says is true. And whatever is known antecedently to revelation, must be known by natural light, and by reasonings and deductions from natural principles. I might further add to this argument, that the only standard and measure to judge of divine revelations, and to distinguish between what are true,

[1] Charles Smyth: op. cit., p. 156.

and what are counterfeit, are the natural notions which men have of God, and of his essential perfections."[1]

Faith therefore for Tillotson was really inferior to reason; since it was by reason that man apprehended the truth about God. "For if this be true, that our understandings are naturally endowed with a sufficient power to assent to any truth that is sufficiently propounded to them; then there can be no necessity to assert that the Spirit of God doth, in the work of faith, raise and elevate our understandings above their natural pitch."[2] The conception of God which resulted from this process was lofty and noble; and Tillotson iterated his conviction that the corollary of a good life and conversation on the part of men was essential and indispensable to the true worship of God and the profession of the Christian verity. Accordingly his chief emphasis in respect of Christ was that of One who went about doing good; and in accordance with the temper of his times, he emphasized revelation as having brought light in the place of mystery and obscurity.

"Nothing was ever more simple and open, more obvious and easy to common imitation, than the life of our blessed Saviour, in which there was nothing dark and mysterious, abstruse and intricate; it was all perfect innocency and goodness; and he carried on one plain and intelligible and uniform design, which was to do all the good he possibly could to all men."[3]

There was an evident nobility and strength in this conception of God and of his requirements in respect of men. But there was also the danger and possibility of degeneration. The goodness of God might easily decline into mere good nature; and the duty of man become little more than an enlightened self-interest. Indeed Tillotson himself did not always escape this peril. In one of the most famous of his sermons, preached from the text "And his commandments are not grievous" (1 John 5. 3), he laboured to prove that Christianity prescribed nothing which was not in the highest self-interest of men. Again in another discourse he observed that "he who entertains the principles of Religion . . . hath this satisfaction, that he hath taken the wisest course and hath consulted his own present peace and future security infinitely better than the atheist hath done, in case he should prove to be mistaken. For it is a fatal mistake to think there is no God if there be one; but a mistake on the other hand hath no future bad consequences depending upon it, nor indeed any great present inconvenience."[4]

If the archbishop himself fell into such ambiguities, it was not to be expected that critics would spare him. "Archbishop Tillotson", mordantly commented Swift, "is the person whom all English free-thinkers own as their head. . . . This great prelate assures us, that all the duties of the Christian religion, with respect to God, are no other but what natural light prompts men to, except the two sacraments, and praying to God in the name and mediation of Christ. As

[1] T. Birch: *Works* of Tillotson (3 vols: 1752), ii, 358.
[2] Ibid., iii, 435. [3] Ibid., iii, 214. [4] Ibid., i, 104.

a priest and prelate, he was obliged to say something of Christianity; but pray observe, sir, how he brings himself off. He justly affirms that even these things are of less moment than natural duties; and because mothers' nursing their children is a natural duty, it is of more moment than the two sacraments or than praying to God in the name and by the mediation of Christ."[1] That there was justification for criticism may be seen from a typical argument of Tillotson concerning the advantages and wisdom of practising Christianity. "For is it not really desirable to every man, that there should be such a Being in the world as takes care of the frame of it, that it do not run into confusion, and in that disorder ruin mankind? That there should be such a Being, as takes particular care of every one of us, and loves us, and delights to do us good; as understands all our wants, and is able and willing to relieve us in our greatest straits when nothing else can; to preserve us in our greatest dangers, to assist us against our worst enemies, and to comfort us under our sharpest sufferings, when all other things set themselves against us? Is it not every man's interest that there should be such a Governor of the world as really designs our happiness, and hath omitted nothing that is necessary to it; as would govern us for our advantage, and will require nothing of us but what is for our good, and yet will infinitely reward us for the doing of that which is best for ourselves?"[2] It was little surprising that Anthony Collins, the author of *A Discourse of Freethinking*, should have commended this endeavour to prove the existence of so accommodating a Deity! "What a charming idea does he give us of the Deity; it is alone sufficient without any further argument to make the atheist wish there were a deity, and by silencing his prejudices, dispose him to conviction."[3]

Canon Smyth has given his opinion that, "as recast by Tillotson, the sermon lost its heroic note, and became a moral essay, the vehicle of a sober, utilitarian, prudential ethic, rather than the proclamation of the gospel of the kingdom of God".[4] The justice of the censure must be allowed. But the compensating virtues must likewise be appraised. The lofty conception of God and the stubborn refusal to accept unworthy standards of conduct ascribed to him, the iterated emphasis upon a good life and moral conduct on the part of the Christian believer, the staunch trust in human reason and the confidence in the ability of men to become fellow-workers with the Truth, represented positive and valuable elements in the Christian tradition. If the favourite maxim of Tillotson's generation was to "fear God and keep his commandments, for this is the whole duty of man", and if it so construed the proportion of faith as to hold with him that "charity is above rubrics", it gave abundant proof of its faith by works; and that particularly in works of charity, such as hospital and charity-school foundations. Tillotson's sermons enjoyed an undoubted vogue in his own day; and as certainly they would

[1] Swift: "Mr C[olli]ns's Discourse of Freethinking", op. cit., iii, 191.
[2] T. Birch: *Works* of Tillotson, i, 19.
[3] A. Collins: *A Discourse of Freethinking*, section iii, 19.
[4] Smyth: op. cit., p. 160.

command no audience to-day. Notwithstanding, the conception of the doctrines and duties of Christianity which they embodied is worthy of recollection and reconsideration in an age which may be thought perhaps to need the admonition, addressed to his own times by his successor in the primacy, that "both at home and abroad we were in danger of losing Christianity in the name of the Church".

NORMAN SYKES.

East African Letter

THE ecclesiastical picture in East Africa is, to say the least, confusing. The Roman Catholics are, of course, doing a most effective work everywhere; they give the impression of having almost unlimited funds at their disposal and, in addition to having had, for some years, an all-African vicariate covering roughly one district of Uganda, have recently introduced a provincial system throughout East Africa which, at least on paper, puts them several, perhaps many, years ahead of the Anglicans in the process of indigenization. Anglicans have seven dioceses (*relatively* small in the case of Zanzibar, Masasi and Southern Tanganyika—under U.M.C.A. leadership; impossibly large in the case of Uganda, the Upper Nile, Mombasa and Central Tanganyika—under C.M.S. and, in the last case, Australian C.M.S. leadership). B.C.M.S. missionaries also work under the bishops of Mombasa and the Upper Nile; the Africa Inland Mission (interdenominational) is careful that all its clergy in the Upper Nile Diocese shall be Anglicans. This is a considerable concession to missionary co-operation on the part of a body which would much prefer to think in terms of uniting all its work in Kenya, Tanganyika, Uganda and the Belgian Congo into a single African Church organized on Baptist principles.

The Presbyterian Church of East Africa (ex-Church of Scotland Mission) is an effective body in the Gikuyu area of Kenya. It is unfortunate that it does not yet include white Presbyterians, who are organized into an overseas presbytery of the Church of Scotland. Methodists are at work in several areas between Nairobi and the coast. Lutherans (both Swedish and American) have widespread activity in Tanganyika and the south-west corner of Kenya. Moravians (whose clergy appear to be mostly Lutheran) are an admirable body in two small areas of Tanganyika. A number of American bodies, such as the Church of God, the Assemblies of God (now the Pentecostal Assemblies of East Africa), the Friends Africa Mission (with the second largest annual meeting in the world and now drawing increasing attention from English Friends), and the National Holiness Mission are at work in Kenya; and the Seventh Day Adventists are becoming a not very wholesome force throughout East Africa. The Christian Council of Kenya, with its associated Educational Secretary for Non-Roman Missions, effectively co-ordinates most of the Christian work of foreign origin in Kenya and acts as liaison with Government; the Tanganyika Christian Council is attempting to do the same;

and in Uganda an Educational Secretary General (paid by Government) acts on behalf of the dioceses of Uganda and the Upper Nile and of the S.D.A.

The picture would not be complete without the mention, first, of the private individuals who buy farms in Kenya and use them as centres of "gospel" preaching and, secondly, of the African sects. The African Greek Orthodox Church in Uganda claims 10,000 members and is largely the creation of one man. It received orders from "Archbishop" Alexander (in the Villatte succession) of Johannesburg but later was accepted into communion by the Greek Patriarch of Alexandria. Alexander also gave orders to independent churches formed in Gikuyu after a large secession caused in 1929 by disagreement over the banning, by the Church of Scotland Mission and the Africa Inland Mission, of female circumcision. These bodies claim 30,000 members but have come under suspicion, and have lost members through return to the missionary churches, during the present emergency. The Nyanza Province of Kenya has a growing number of, frequently curious, sects. It is notable that these appear to rise mainly in an area of high population density (and therefore of social tension) where the missionary churches are largely congregational in organization. The Abamalaki in Uganda are a Judaizing sect, rejecting medicine, dating back to 1890. They have caused trouble in the past through resistance to inoculation of man and beast; but they are on the wane. In the kingdom of Buganda there is at present a wide-scale return to frank tribal paganism, due to the alleged complicity of the Church in the deposition of the Kabaka.

There has been for many years talk of the formation of an Anglican Province of East Africa; but it has always foundered on the same fears as oppose East African federation. The Archbishop of Canterbury, like the Colonial Office, is regarded as an essential barrier against the wicked settler; and the Conference of East and Central African Bishops fulfils something of the same role as the East African High Commission, except that it has no central services to administer and no secretariat to control them. The latest—and more hopeful—move is towards the creation of a Province of Uganda, involving the breaking down into a number of smaller dioceses of the existing dioceses of Uganda and the Upper Nile. It is not clear that such a move will make what is still largely regarded as the white man's religion any more acceptable to politically minded Africans in an age of nationalism; for the Church to become genuinely indigenous it seems almost certain that some African Church leaders must also become leaders in the nationalist camp (as the Roman Catholic Bishop Kiwanuka may well do). But a province will at least provide the framework of a genuinely national Church; and from the administrative point of view the breaking down of the East African dioceses is long overdue. Few English diocesans have areas larger than an East African rural deanery; and, though population here is smaller, communications are almost unbelievably worse. The proposal was put to the Uganda Synod last year; but it seems unlikely that it will bear fruit for at least another five years.

Such a development must, if only for financial reasons—but more importantly for the right development of the Church—depend on the appointment of African bishops. The Uganda diocese has for several years had two, the Upper Nile one; and on 15th May, in the Cathedral Church of St Paul, just outside Kampala, the Archbishop of Canterbury consecrated two for the diocese of Mombasa and one for Central Tanganyika (in addition to one for the Sudan, outside the East African sphere).[1] But it is a very serious question how far the present African clergy are competent to carry the burdens even of a small diocese in the modern world. In the early days of the Christian mission to East Africa, ordination carried with it not only social prestige but a cash income, in a large number of cases supplementing a sufficiency of crops grown on the priest's own land. But to-day social prestige is to be found in other walks of life and a young graduate from Makerere College, who can earn £550 as an initial salary in teaching or Government employment, can hardly be blamed if he does not give a second glance at the possibility of earning £90 as a priest—especially when his standard of education will make him liable to almost unlimited financial demands from a wide circle of relatives. To the best of the writer's knowledge, out of men who have passed through Makerere in the last ten years, one from Kenya is at present training in America for the ministry of the Africa Inland Mission; one Anglican and one Presbyterian from Kenya are hoping seriously to be ordained in years to come; and two from Uganda have been given scholarships, starting respectively in 1955 and 1956, to study theology in England. It is an encouraging sign that governments (in both these cases, African Local Governments) are prepared to give scholarships for this purpose. But the Roman Catholics, with their high standard of training for the priesthood available in East Africa, are far ahead of the rest of us; and this matter is one to which urgent attention should be given. It is the writer's view that little advance is likely to be made until theology in some form or another is included as a degree subject at Makerere, but, unless independent funds become available (about £250,000 would be an adequate endowment!), there is no hope at least before the end of 1960. At present it is rare for candidates for the ministry to have achieved so much as school certificate; and it is manifestly impossible for such men, however good and devoted they themselves may be, to deal with the problems of the rapidly growing class of educated Africans or with the increasing complexities of diocesan administration.

East Africa is at present in a "frontier" stage of development, involving tremendous tensions not only for Africans who have to adjust themselves to entirely new, and more complex, ways of living, but (if they only knew it) for Europeans who have to change their attitude from beneficent paternalism to partnership or even to the service of African masters. The growing nationalism is already facing the churches with problems for which we are too slenderly equipped.

[1] It is noticeable, as an index of the relations between Church and State in Buganda, that his visit was viewed with as much dislike by African politicians as that of the Queen last year.

It is against this background that the sects of Nyanza Province are to be understood. It is probably also against this background that we must try to understand both Mau Mau and the Revival. It seems at least possible that both are extreme reactions to the same situation. Against social tensions and race relationships which (despite intimate personal relations between individuals of different races) are desperately unsure, one group adopts a political faith which is consciously anti-Christian as well as anti-white; the other discovers an intense experience of private salvation, tending to perfectionism and regarding social, political and economic issues as irrelevant. The strength of Revival lies in the reconciliation of persons, so that, from the start, it has been genuinely free of racial discrimination and jealousies; for this reason it has come under particular fire from Mau Mau and its success may even have been the precipitating cause of violence in October 1952. Its loyalty to the faith under bitter persecution will join the martyrdoms of all the ages; and perhaps one of its most remarkable features is that, despite its relative intolerance of non-Revivalist Christians, it has yet remained within the Church, giving a witness which, however one-sided, is essential to the renewal of vitality in a body which too often identifies Christian discipleship with education and Western material standards. But something more true to the Incarnation is required if the Church is to meet the challenge both of developing society and of the nationalisms which offer their own answers to that challenge. The East African Frontier is advancing fast in education, technology and political structure. It is not clear that the Church has the equipment, either of men or thought, to keep step with this advance. Established schools and hospitals, and the increasing weight of diocesan administration, require efficiency rather than the spirit of the pioneer; and even the ablest men tend to become tied to the administrative machine. One of the urgent decisions of missionary policy is whether the limited resources of men and money should be thus used: or whether the true strategy of to-day does not lie in handing over to Africans, with all the loss in efficiency which such a step would involve, the existing machinery—and sending out as missionaries men who would, on the one hand, be theologians of the frontier and, on the other, pioneer the development of religious communities to be centres of devotion and experiment in Christian living. F. B. WELBOURN.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

The Rev. A. H. Couratin is Principal of St Stephen's House, Oxford.

The Rev. Alan Shaw is Divinity Master at the Queen Elizabeth Grammar School, Wakefield.

Dr Sykes is Dixie Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the University of Cambridge.

The Rev. F. B. Welbourn is Warden of Mitchell Hall, Makarere College, the University College of East Africa.

CORRESPONDENCE

THE SPIRIT OF GOD IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

May I be permitted to defend my statement in the April number of your journal that there is no doctrine of the Holy Spirit to be found in the Old Testament?

The whole Bible, of course, is, in the words of the late Dr Wheeler Robinson, the Book of the Spirit, and the idea moves from mana to monotheism. In order to understand any of the great religious ideas of the Hebrews, it is a safe method to take one or other of the key words and follow its development, words such as "holiness", "loving-kindness", "salvation" and so on. And as the first of these, "holiness", possessed at first no moral content whatever, but could be thought of rather in terms of dangerous supernatural power, of the high-tension electric cable variety, requiring effective insulation on the part of any human being coming into contact with a holy thing or place or being, so too the term "spirit", *ruach*, had an equally non-moral origin, being thought of as a powerful invasive energy, like the desert wind (*ruach* means both "wind" and "spirit", as does the Greek *pneuma*), the very breath of God which entering into man possessed him. By means of this superhuman vitality Samson was able to tear a young lion, limb from limb, with his bare hands, and, at the close of his tragic captivity, again by the exercise of sheer physical strength, pull down the supporting pillars of the temple of Dagon upon the heads of himself and his enemies. The simple explanation of this abnormal power was found in his being reinforced by the *ruach* of Yahweh. Sometimes it might be an evil spirit from the Lord which came upon some individual, as it did to King Saul, driving him to bouts of madness; or it could operate to harden Pharaoh's heart to rebel against him. The earliest ideas, then, of the spirit of the Lord are associated with that which is unusual, mysterious, unaccountable in a man's behaviour. The spirit stands for divine power but it has as yet no moral significance.

On a slightly higher plane is the belief that the ecstatic frenzy of the early prophets is similarly attributable to the spirit of God which invades and possesses them, though this spirit-possession is at times something more significant than its psycho-physical accompaniments might suggest; for while these "prophets" dance and gesticulate, utter strange cries and fling themselves to the ground in hysterics, there may well come a "word of the Lord", an authentic oracle, a divine message which in a measure may "redeem" their grotesque behaviour and give them some real standing among their fellows as God's spokesmen. This is most certainly the case with such prophets as Elijah and Elisha, upon whom the *ruach* of Yahweh descends to empower them as champions of the true faith of Israel, and to give them decisive utterance in God's name. When Elijah confronts the guilty Ahab in Naboth's vineyard there is no need for any physical

demonstration to reinforce the prophet's divine authority; in the spirit of the Lord he faces outraged royalty with other-worldly power.

But while the spirit-possession of the prophets still tends to emphasize the abnormal, it may so deeply and evenly invade the whole man that David's spiritual maturity and Solomon's outstanding wisdom are alike conceived as due to the indwelling spirit of God, heightening normal rather than implanting abnormal powers.

From this it is no great step to the idea of God's spirit setting apart, equipping and commissioning such outstanding spiritual leaders as Amos, Hosea, Isaiah and Jeremiah. The physical side of the spirit's invasion of a man is now in the background, and the psychical accompaniments are secondary, though still manifesting themselves in symbolic behaviour and heightened awareness of God's presence. The essential authority of the prophetic word is in its "givenness"—something in no way attributable to ordinary human endowment; it is a true message from God mediated by his spirit indwelling the heart and mind of a dedicated servant.

While there has been a large and quite obvious development of the idea of "spirit" from its earliest physical manifestations to this moral and spiritual endowment of man by his Creator, it is still not permissible to think and speak of the spirit of the Lord as THE HOLY SPIRIT in the New Testament sense. Even the psalmist who prays "Take not thy holy spirit from me" is not speaking or thinking of the Holy Ghost as Jesus or his disciples spoke of him. Of course the Nicene creed refers to him as speaking "by the prophets"; but that is merely a legitimate reading back of a Christian experience into the Old Testament era. It would be safe to think of the Christian doctrine of the Holy Spirit as emerging at the advent of Christ, who was himself the recipient of the Holy Ghost at his baptism and promised that this selfsame Holy Spirit should indwell the hearts and minds of his followers after his physical Presence had been finally withdrawn. Only at this stage are we justified in thinking of the Holy Ghost as fully personalized.

CAWTHORNE VICARAGE,
NR. BARNSLEY.

Yours, etc.,
F. BARRIE FLINT.

"THE WORD OF GOD IN THE LIFE OF MAN"

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

SIR,

I think that the Rev. G. R. Sansbury is unfair in his notice of *The Word of God in the Life of Man* in the June THEOLOGY. About half of this book came out early in 1954 and I found the Lent course most helpful in giving me ideas for the Parish Communion addresses in Lent that year. Never for a moment did it occur to me to use the text verbatim. What self-respecting preacher could use another person's work like that? The general introduction to my edition makes it clear that such was not the intention. "They will need that

adaptation to environment and that enrichment with illustration which can be given only by the preacher himself." Hence Mr Sansbury's sarcastic quotation from the Palm Sunday address loses its point. The quotation contains, however, an important point which is worth while trying to put over, namely that humility at one time despised, has, by the incarnation, been shown to be a virtue.

Yours, etc.,

SANDRIDGE,
ST ALBANS.

E. GILES.

"THE FELLOWSHIP OF THE RING"

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

I write in indignation at Mr Jackman's review of Professor Tolkien's book *The Fellowship of the Ring* in the June issue of THEOLOGY. Doubtless the book has faults, but its qualities are outstanding. It is a work of real integrity—that is, it is true at all levels, as good reading for children as for adults. Your reviewer complains that he is not told what the book is about: "Is this an allegory . . . or a piece of religious mythology?" (a clumsy phrase). Surely it is a measure of Prof. Tolkien's achievement that he can write without having to think or say with half his mind (as the moderns mostly do): "Now I am being religious; now I am writing poetry." His learning in myth and folklore has enabled him to touch the springs of human symbolism: and through his world charity breathes.

In his preface to *That Hideous Strength*, Prof. C. S. Lewis wrote ten years ago: "Those who would learn further about Numinor and the True West must (alas!) await the publication of much that still exists only in the MSS of my friend Professor J. R. R. Tolkien."

Mr Jackman talks of "small talk and muddle"—this book must be taken seriously; it is his own imagination that is small and his own mind that is muddled.

Yours faithfully,

20 WORTON ROAD,
ISLEWORTH.
6 *June* 1955.

VICTOR DE WAAL.

"THE REFORMATION IN ENGLAND"

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

Your reviewer of Fr Hughes' *Reformation in England*, Vol. III, appears convinced by the writer's claim that the danger of treason was not the real reason for the Elizabethan government's hostility to the papists.

Dr Conyers Read, in his new book, *Mr Secretary Cecil and Queen Elizabeth*, writes thus: "Cecil's policy towards the English Catholics at this juncture, as indeed throughout his life, was determined, not

by hostility to their faith as such, but by fear of their uprising" (p. 263).

This view gains support from Archbishop Parker's letter to Cecil from Canterbury in 1564 when French invasion was feared. Concerning Bishop Thirlby and Dean Boxall, in custody at Bekesbourne, he wrote: "I put it to your consideration what were best to be done with my two guests which ye sent me, in this time and country, in such vicinity; although I judge by their words that they be true Englishmen, not wishing to be subject to the governance of such insolent conquerors" (*Parker Correspondence*, p. 203).

It was surely political opposition, irrespective of faith, that Cecil feared. Indeed the deposed Catholic Bishop Thirlby, until his death in 1570, enjoyed the friendship and hospitality of Archbishop Parker at Lambeth.

It was Cecil, the statesman, rather than Parker, the churchman, who occasionally demanded an extra turn of the screw.

St Gabriel's,
Pimlico.

Yours faithfully,
T. F. Shirley.

"THE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND"

To the Editor of Theology.

Dear Sir,

May I venture to suggest that Canon Turner may be in error in assuming, in his article "The Historic Episcopate and After", that the words "Church of Scotland" in the Bidding Prayer refer to the Presbyterian Kirk?

Although this prayer (Canon 55 of 1604) was drawn up six years before the "Scottish Consecrations" of 1610 formally restored the apostolic succession to the Church of Scotland, several "titular" bishops nevertheless already held office in Scotland (one of them, in spite of the protests of the Kirk, baptized Prince Henry); and in view of this, I submit that the words "Church of Scotland" in the prayer can only refer to a Church under Episcopal supervision—a Church to-day represented, not by the Presbyterian Kirk, but by the disestablished (Episcopal) Church of Scotland.

Cramond,
Fleet.

Yours faithfully,
A. E. Hathaway Tucker.

19 *June* 1955.

BOOK REVIEWS

A Companion to the Study of St Augustine. Edited by Roy W. Battenhouse. Oxford University Press. 32s. 6d.

When the sixteenth centenary of St Augustine's death was celebrated in 1930, the only *Festschrift* in English was the volume entitled *A Monument to St Augustine*, by a group of Roman Catholic writers. At that time Augustine seems to have been little studied by

American scholars and theologians. Scarcely any American authors appear in the comprehensive bibliography of works up to 1927 appended to Etienne Gilson's well-known "Introduction". Perhaps, then, it may be a sign of the times that for the sixteenth centenary of the saint's birth, which came last year, sixteen American theologians, all of them(if I am not mistaken) Protestant, should have combined to produce this "Companion", "as a tribute to St Augustine's importance and a guide to the study of his works", inspired by "a common awareness of Augustine's signal value for our understanding of Western culture and for our grappling with present-day issues".

The authors are members of a theological society which shortly after the war devoted a number of its meetings to the discussion of papers on Augustine, which proved "immensely beneficial" to the participants. The book which is the product of these discussions is "as a whole directed more toward the learner than the specialist"; and for this purpose it is well planned. Part I begins with a short introduction on the significance of Augustine for to-day; and this is followed by a biographical sketch. The disproportionately large space here given to the period covered by the *Confessions* is to some extent compensated by a third chapter on Augustine as pastor. Part II, which occupies half the volume, deals with the principal works, grouped in seven sections; it is regrettable that neither here nor elsewhere in the book is there anything like an adequate treatment of the *Sermons* and *Homilies* (including the great *Expositions of the Psalms*). Part III contains a series of chapters on special aspects of Augustine's thought: Faith and Reason, Creation, Christology, Ethics, and the Devotional Life.

To each chapter there is appended a list of three or four books suggested for further reading, and naturally enough these are chiefly taken from works in the English language. Few of the writers, however, disclose much acquaintance with the intensive Augustinian studies which have been carried on by Continental theologians in recent years. No doubt they were very properly concerned with reporting on what Augustine himself had to say. But the result is to make some of the criticisms upon defects in his theology and ethics, and in particular upon the relation of his Christianity to his Neo-Platonism, appear a little out-dated. There is a certain amount of inaccuracy in detail: thus we are told that Julian of Eclanum "arose to defend what has often been called Semi-Pelagianism" (p. 47), that Augustine presided at the Council of Carthage which condemned Caelestius in 411 (p. 204), and that the Council of Orange in 529 "sought to draw a firm line between *sovereign* and *irresistible* grace" (p. 362). And I fear that St Jerome would be less pleased than Orosius at finding their names coupled as those of "two influential western theologians" (p. 205). In at least one chapter the references have been very imperfectly checked; and in a number of cases quotations have been applied in a way which shows misunderstanding of their purport in their original contexts. If these may be regarded as minor blemishes in view of the general purpose of the work, it is a more serious matter that no attempt has been made to trace the

major developments in Augustine's religious thought, and that in what is said of his teaching on the Church and on the Person of Christ no mention is made of so fundamental an element in his theology as the doctrine of the Mystical Body.

But when all faults have been found, it would be ungrateful not to acknowledge the admirable combination of enthusiasm and candour displayed by the writers, or to welcome their work as a contribution to the renewal, in this country as well as in America, of understanding and appreciation of what they well describe as "the continuing vitality of Augustinian wisdom". May it encourage many to make their own exploration of that wisdom, and to find like the Queen of Sheba that the half had not been told them!

J. Burnaby.

Trinity College,
Cambridge.

Histoire de la Tolérance au Siècle de la Réforme. By Joseph Lecler, S.J. Two volumes. Paris: F. Aubier. 2,985 frs.

The author of these substantial volumes of 864 pages is already known to English readers by his former work entitled *L'Église et la Souveraineté de l'État* (1946), of which a translation, *The Two Sovereignties,* was published by Messrs Burns Oates and Washbourne in 1952. Even allowing for the exclusion of Spain, Italy and "les pays nordiques", his new work is one of greater amplitude and difficulty and presents an intricate and tangled story with masterly skill and reasonable dispassionateness of judgment: its eight sections review in turn the biblical, patristic and medieval background, Christian Humanism, the problem of Religious Liberty in the Empire, the Reform Movements in Switzerland and Poland and France, the Revolution and Struggles for Religious Liberty in the Low Countries, and finally in 127 pages "La Réforme Anglicane" with a conclusion and an admirable series of indexes. Each book has numerous sub-divisions, copiously annotated with lists of authorities. In a work necessarily of rigorous compression Père Lecler's terse and even at times lively style carries the reader's attention and interest without more than occasional and transitory weariness through the enormous mass of detail which has been collected, dissected and arranged in pattern. Sympathy will be felt with the writer's vigorously expressed detestation of cruelty in whatever quarter he finds it and the even surprising frankness which he sometimes allows himself in criticizing what may be called the diplomatic blunders of ecclesiastical authority. Whether he is dealing with the proceedings of the Duke of Alba in the Low Countries or the massacre of St Bartholomew or the policy of Popes like Pius V or Gregory XIII, he does his best to explain the position not anachronistically, even if with modern comments, and the difficulties to which he calls attention from the outset involved in the ambiguity of "tolérance" and "tolérer" find a fitting example also in the remarkable letter which he cites from Zwingli to Oecolampadius (3 January 1527): "Il faut faire com-

prendre au Sénat [*sc.* à Bâle] combien il est dangereux de permettre que dans une même ville le peuple soit tiré en tout sens par des prédications divergentes."

What has been said will not exclude the possibility and even probability that readers will be moved from time to time to vigorous question-marks or other indications of dissent. This may easily be the case in regard to the various sections dealing with the position in England. It is a matter to which the author has clearly devoted a good deal of attention, and we may therefore hope that it will not seem ungenerous to complain that his work exhibits rather frequently impressions of being derived too much *ab extra*. His remarks on Erastianism are less enlightening than they might be, and while no one would wish to discount unduly the value of the volumes of Mr. W. K. Jordan on Toleration it is permissible to wish that Père Lecler had been less strongly influenced by the picture which Mr Jordan draws. The character of Elizabeth I as here sketched does her far less than justice. We are twice told that she was "très peu religieuse au fond" and it is bluntly said that "tous les historiens le reconnaissent", Professor J. B. Black and Mr Jordan being cited as authorities for the statement. And it is added that "elle a fondé l'Anglicanisme comme une solution moyenne, la plus compatible avec son idéal politique de caractère tout profane et séculier". The writer is of course entitled to his point of view, though it may seriously be questioned if it be justifiable, and this is certainly not the way in which history should be written.

Claude Jenkins.

Christ Church,
Oxford.

Esther, Song of Songs, Lamentations. Torch Bible Commentaries. By G. A. F. Knight. S.C.M. Press. 7s. 6d.

In this series, designed as it is for the non-theological layman and based on the A.V. text, it is often the Introduction which is the most significant part of the book, and there is not very much in the verse-by-verse comment in this latest volume which calls for discussion; but Professor Knight's approach to these books as set out in the introductory chapters will undoubtedly gladden many a heart as it will also raise many an eyebrow. For here is the "Christian re-discovery of the Old Testament" in full cry.

Esther is presented as a book which testifies to the divine rule of history. True, God is not mentioned, though the attempt is made to claim 4. 14 "from another place" as a "euphemism" ("designation"?) for the Deity. But Professor Knight recognizes the book to be an historical novel—he compares it to Lloyd Douglas's *The Robe* or Sholem Asch's *The Nazarene*. "For Hebrew writers deliberately to invent a situation in order to show how God would certainly act in judgment and in mercy had a highly practical value" (p. 21). But the fact is that the book is not a *religious* historical novel, and that even if it were, it could testify only to Hebrew faith in God's rule in history—not to that rule itself. For that, only historical event will suffice, and that *Esther* is not.

The Song of Songs is approached in less doctrinaire a manner. The book is viewed as a love-anthology, and its purpose in Scripture is to declare that for the sanctified man *eros* is as much of God as *agape*. It was written by one man, "no mere uneducated peasant . . . a thinking man . . . a religious man. . . . He is aware that it [erotic love] is actually of God himself . . ." (p. 67). Not many commentators would dare to tell so much about "the" author, nor so readily assume his religious character, but the exegesis soundly eschews allegory and typology and is honest with the text.

Lamentations is introduced by the caption "suffered under Nebuchadnezzar, was crucified, dead and buried, he descended into hell". After a brief account of Israel's "factual story" we are then promised "the interpretation which Israel's prophets and priests, looking back, set upon" it (p. 100), but the two sections which follow are inevitably a sketch of Professor Knight's Biblical Theology. Another writer would undoubtedly give a somewhat different account of what Israel's prophets and priests made of their history. This is unavoidable, though the reader could have been warned against the impression that somewhere in the Bible he would come across the kind of interpretation which the author sketches; but when *Lamentations* is then attached to this Biblical Theology by means of the word "fire" and a whole catena of fire-references, and we discover that the word occurs only four times in *Lamentations*, and then not in significant contexts, we begin to suspect that we are being given more eisegesis than exegesis. The interpretation of Israel's sufferings proceeds by constant reference to our Lord's passion, so that "the relationship of the event sung in the book of *Lamentations* to the Cross of Christ in the New Testament now becomes apparent . . ." (p. 113), and there follows a highly compact and forceful account of the central truths of the Gospel. As one strongly in sympathy with the present attempt to rehabilitate the Old Testament among Christian people, the present writer must nevertheless ask whether this is the right way to do it. To indicate the relation of Israel's lament to the larger whole of Old Testament Theology is indeed a proper task, as Gottwald has recently shown, but to produce the whole Christian Gospel out of *Lamentations* tells more about the commentator than the book. These three writings have their unquestioned purpose in Holy Scripture, but whether Professor Knight has succeeded in elucidating that purpose the present writer takes leave to doubt. That Professor Knight has written a book which will enrich and encourage very many can be in no doubt whatsoever.

Didsbury College,
Bristol.

S. B. Frost.

Essays in Christian Unity. By Henry St John, O.P. Blackfriars. 12s. 6d.

For many years the review *Blackfriars* has put forward a distinctive viewpoint in contemporary Roman Catholicism, and in this

volume Fr St John has collected some papers which he has contributed over the years on the subject of Church Unity. Addressed properly to Roman Catholics, they constitute a moving plea for the "ecumenical attitude" within the Roman Church. The author also asks for thankful acknowledgement of the grace of God working within the Church but outside the Roman obedience, and in particular he desires a just appreciation of the Church of England. (In this connexion there are unfortunate misprints on pp. 56 f., where the footnotes should refer to the Report of the Archbishops' Commission on Christian Doctrine, and not to the Memorandum upon it.)

This is a book for Anglicans as well as for Roman Catholics. It would be difficult to imagine a Roman Catholic convert, holding the views that he must hold, writing with greater clarity or charity. What a contrast to the latest C.T.S. pamphlet on *Infallible Fallacies*! Fr St John writes discerningly of *pietas Anglicana*, and in his own way he still dearly loves the Church of his youth. Everywhere the author succeeds in communicating a deep and infectious love of our Lord, which, as he first discovered at a S.C.M. conference, transcends barriers of church or dogma.

But does he *really* understand the Church of England? Owing perhaps to a Tractarian upbringing, he consistently ignores its Protestantism and seems entirely ignorant of any "Evangelical Revival". Its pragmatism is not mentioned: and when he writes that "it is alive and full of spiritual vitality, but this is partially paralysed by the fact that it comprehends elements that are mutually exclusive", he does not seem to have realized that this very vitality may be due to the very comprehensiveness which he so deplores.

Fr St John defines the "ecumenical attitude" as a "spirit of friendliness, sympathy and mutual understanding, a spirit which lays aside the psychology of war and rejects all controversy of the win-a-victory type, and which, without surrendering one iota of principle, attempts to enter into the minds of those who differ from us". He is clear that truth is held, not *in vacuo*, but by persons in concrete situations, and he pleads again and again that unity can come only through personal contact and friendship. All this is finely said. But when he takes to task a former contributor to this journal for speaking of "Rome's tragic rejection" of the ecumenical movement, a demur must be made. Ecumenism certainly demands convictions, not concessions, but implicit in the "ecumenical attitude" is the willingness to admit that no one Church has a monopoly of truth. Here Fr St John is of course adamant: to ask for the alteration of *de fide* dogma is, he admits, like "crying for the moon".

Fr St John can hardly expect one of his "separated brethren" to agree with much of what he writes. Anglo-Catholics in particular will dislike being regarded as a kind of cold frame by which the Protestant world may be "brought on" to Rome. For all its honesty and sobriety, penitence and penetration, this book on the human level induces despair quite as much as admiration. Fr St John, however, is well aware that, however urgent is the need for reunion, only

God can effect it in his own time: man can but till the soil. Here at any rate is first-class husbandry.

HUGH MONTEFIORE.

GONVILLE AND CAIUS COLLEGE,
CAMBRIDGE.

MORALS AND MEDICINE. By Joseph Fletcher. Gollancz. 15s.

This is an interesting, readable and important book on the morals of certain problems of medical practice. In his foreword Dr Carl Menninger describes it as "a great contribution to philosophy, morality and medicine". It is most emphatically not any of those things. (It should be made clear that the present reviewer writes as a physician and not a theologian.)

To the book's credit let it first be said that it is enthusiastic and debonair, and written with a great verve; it lacks the emotional costiveness which characterizes so much English writing. The book deals with five problems: telling the patient, contraception, artificial insemination, sterilization and euthanasia. And in every case it takes what might be called "the modern view". It is entirely humanistic in its approach and champions in every case without demur the right to free choice by the patient. In support of his point of view the author quotes the allegedly historical resistance of the Church to any form of progress in the ethical field; he is apparently quite convinced that the Christian religion, at any rate in its institutional aspects, is altogether reactionary. It is clear that the author is widely read and presumably understands the background of theology and biblical criticism. He has in a later chapter an excellent short account of the difference between the New Testament conceptions of *ψύχη* and *πνεῦμα*, and writes excellently on the Christian view of the immortality of the soul arising out of those conceptions. And yet his use of argument is catastrophic. In the first and last chapters on general principles, arguments are constantly used in an entirely irresponsible manner. Any sort of *non sequitur* is available to bolster up his position.

Prof. Fletcher's basic conception upon which his judgments are based is this: "Man's quality as a moral being depends first upon his possession of freedom of choice and second upon his knowledge of the courses of action open to his choice." He goes on to imply that man has reached, in the twentieth-century American scene, an unprecedented moral stature simply through the ability by scientific advance to manipulate his circumstances, and that this ability confers upon him a complete freedom to do as he pleases.

It is tempting to deal with each of his five chapters in turn to show how he has failed to appreciate fully the problems he deals with, or to justify in a reasonable manner the position he adopts, but space does not allow. Two examples of his method must suffice. First, a syllogism from his justification of A.I.D. (not a very important question in England as yet): The Archbishop of Canterbury has defended the primacy of procreation in marriage; artificial insemina-

tion with a donor's semen can produce offspring to a marriage otherwise childless; the Archbishop of Canterbury has condemned A.I.D. as adulterous; therefore the Archbishop is (*a*) illogical and (*b*) inhuman. Secondly, an argument from his justification of euthanasia: "Incurable pain", he says, "destroys self-possession and disintegrates personality", therefore a patient should be allowed, with due legal safeguards, to ask a physician for a lethal drug. Can it really be that he has so little experience, or else such blindness, that he has not seen patients of intractable pain who have developed those finest flowers of personality which most excite the admiration and praise of even the most thoroughgoing humanist?

It should not be thought that this reviewer, however much he may reject the conclusions Prof. Fletcher reaches, does not hold that there *are* arguments for each position that he adopts.

His last chapter on the "ethics of personality" is as tendentious as the rest, and his conception of the dignity of human personality is built on an entirely sub-Christian foundation. "Man", he says, "is made in the image of God, and therefore he is self-conscious saying 'I am', and he is self-determined saying 'I will'." There is no suggestion that it has always been the teaching of Christianity that man can reach his full stature of selfhood only when he has learnt to say "Thy will be done" with full enthusiasm and sincerity.

What Prof. Fletcher has done is to write a book passionately justifying a twentieth-century American concept of scientific humanism and to call it a serious attempt to discuss the moral theology of medical practice. In criticizing a book one wholeheartedly disagrees with, it is only too easy to be both uncharitable and reactionary. It must be admitted that Prof. Fletcher does not give a backward glance; but there is not a single problem discussed in this book to which he brings a specifically Christian insight.

EXMOUTH. R. H. HARDY.

SHORTER NOTICES

EARLY CHRISTIANITY. The Purpose of Acts, and other papers. By Burton Scott Easton, edited by F. C. Grant. S.P.C.K. 12s. 6d.

JESUS AND THE KINGDOM OF GOD. By Harold Roberts. Epworth Press. 12s. 6d.

THE PASTORAL EPISTLES. The Greek Text with Introduction and Commentary. By E. K. Simpson. Tyndale Press. 15s.

The central problem of New Testament studies can be stated in terms of two closely related questions: What was the original form of the Gospel message? and how did it grow into the faith and order of the Church? The late Dr Easton devoted a lifetime of scholarship to this task. *Early Christianity* is a slim volume, but it bears eloquent witness to his great industry and erudition, both in the editor's biographical introduction and in the papers collected to make the book. In "The Purpose of Acts" (published in 1936 as a "Theology Occa-

sional Paper") he postulates a deliberate tendency on the part of Luke—to show that the Christian "way" does not necessitate a break with Judaism, and therefore the Roman authorities may protect it as a *religio licita*. It is a pity that his handling of the evidence depends so much on the unquestioned assumption that Theophilus is an influential Roman official. His account of baptism and the gift of the Spirit needs to be corrected in the light of more recent work. But the outstanding merit of this essay is his grasp of the great complexity of the issues, so that he refuses to search for a unity of doctrine which never had existed. This is the theme of the final essay in the book, entitled "Authority and Liberty in the New Testament", in which he shows a fine appreciation of the way in which presuppositions influence the interpretation of Biblical evidence. Ultimately the Christian faith is founded on a Person, not on a system of beliefs, and St Paul is true to this fact when he hands on the *paradosis* to his spiritual offspring. This final paper is the weighty last message from a great New Testament scholar.

Jesus and the Kingdom of God is a more general work on the same great problem. The author begins with a survey of the work of the last fifty years on the meaning of the Kingdom, and gives the last word to Professor C. H. Dodd; but in spite of this his own concluding pages are a restatement of the traditional doctrine of the Parousia and Judgment. But this is only the last aspect of a careful analysis of the idea of the Kingdom, which shows that the Church's teaching about the person and work of our Lord is already contained in it in germ. It is unfortunate that the reader is put off at the outset by the curious claim that the rediscovery of Biblical eschatology is producing "a new terminology . . . which, by comparison, makes the language of traditional theology pale into complete intelligibility [*sic*]"; for this does not dispose him favourably to accept the sketchy array of Biblical evidence on which the argument rests. The treatment of our Lord's "little children" sayings does not avoid sentimentalism. The problems raised by the title Son of Man are much too easily disposed of. But Dr Roberts is primarily a systematic theologian, and when he moves on to his home ground the book springs to life. The very thoughtful chapters on the Doctrine of God and the Person of Christ will be most valuable to all who are engaged in preaching and teaching the faith, for here traditional doctrines are carefully thought through, taking into account modern difficulties. In fact these two chapters are sufficient alone to recommend this book to thinking people.

Questions of authorship are bound to exercise the minds of students of the transmission of the Gospel, and the provenance of the Pastoral Epistles is still a baffling problem. The Rev. E. K. Simpson's commentary is primarily a plea in favour of St Paul, possibly for doctrinaire reasons, and certainly without much understanding of the motives of pseudepigraphy in the sub-apostolic age. He bases his case mostly on the evidence of Greek words and phrases and shows an impressive familiarity with Hellenistic Greek. The predominant interest in authorship very much spoils the continuous

exposition in the commentary, but there is such a fine discrimination in estimating the meanings of words that the book can be of real assistance to students.

Barnabas Lindars, S.S.F.

Cambridge.

The Birth of Modern Education: The Contribution of the Dissenting Academies, 1660–1800. By J. W. Ashley Smith. Independent Press. 19s. 6d.

When Miss Parker wrote her well-known book on *Dissenting Academies in England*, she modestly acknowledged its inadequacies, expressing the hope that it would stimulate others to make a more thorough exploration of this field than she had been able to do. That was forty years ago, and meanwhile for our knowledge of Dissenting Academies we have relied largely on her pilot survey, supplemented by some further useful research by Dr H. McLachlan recorded in his *English Education under the Test Acts* (1931). Now at long last comes this substantial study by Mr Ashley Smith, scholarly, readable, well documented; he will be rewarded for long hours spent in Dr Williams' and other libraries, searching and researching, by the gratitude of all who are interested in our educational tradition. His book will be appreciated not only by those concerned with the development of modern education but also by many interested in the growth of theological studies. For several of the academies served a dual purpose, and have influenced education in two distinct spheres.

Modern education has a debatable pedigree, and some would date its beginnings further back and some later than the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. But if, as the title of this book implies, it was born then, there are other claimants to dispute paternity with the dissenting academies. For they were not the only type of school to pioneer at that period with a new curriculum; several Mathematical Schools were then established, more especially to meet the needs of the growing number of pupils intending to engage in sea-borne trade. In his autobiography Leigh Hunt, with filial devotion to his old school, tells of Christ's Hospital's pride in its mathematical side, initiated in 1673; and, as Mr Ashley Smith observes, after the completion of his book Dr Hans' *New Trends in English Education in the Eighteenth Century* was published, telling of several interesting ventures in non-academic education besides those of the Dissenting Academies. But, as the Spens Committee recognized, the latter constitute the first systematic attempt in this country to provide a well-considered alternative to the traditional curriculum of the grammar school. Mr Ashley Smith sheds much new light on this curriculum, and also on the qualifications and personalities of the tutors. To do justice to this excellent book much more ought to be said in commendation; it is a valuable contribution to our knowledge of the history of education in England and Wales.

W. O. Lester Smith.

MR PEPYS AND NONCONFORMITY. By A. G. Matthews. Independent Press. 8s. 6d.

The specialist on the Restoration Settlement will long have been aware of his debt to Mr Matthews; here are four studies on aspects of Puritanism which may attract the general reader with an interest in modern English church history. The author, whose indomitable industry revised, corrected, and supplemented both *Calamy* (in 1934) and *Walker* (1948), now runs more lightly through the immortal Diary of Samuel Pepys and the famous Letters of Dorothy Osborne. The third subject, "the good Lord Wharton" (d. 1696) and his son and heir, "the blasphemous Tom Wharton" (d. 1715), is particularly valuable as being less familiar and most illuminative of the emergence of political Whiggism out of one side of the Puritan revolt. All three essays elaborate the disgust of the "moderates" at the deprivations, arrests, and imprisonments of the ejected ministers. It is a familiar tale but recounted here with a freshness and liveliness from the non-theological side. Further, it is a good thing to be reminded, as a half-dozen pen-portraits of Puritan gentry here suggest, that Puritans, like the rest of men, are not properly reducible to one category; they were not all precisians and dogmatists; some were charitable humanists and not a few were adept florists, no more willing than Pepys or Temple to countenance the hard-baked fanatic and rebel. Mr Matthews himself is likewise a very gentle and moderate Nonconformist and on the whole his verdict is on the side of the Tory Anglican as against the time-serving Roundhead turned political Whig. Probably he would agree with Gwatkin that if the bishops were "insolent" the Puritans were "unreasonable".

That this is his verdict seems plain from the final study of Puritan ideas of liturgical revision, where indeed the reviewer would question whether the author is altogether fair to Richard Baxter, who more than once emphatically denied that the Common Prayer Book was "an invented form which God rejecteth". And what of Reynolds of Norwich who composed that magnificent piece of liturgical prose, the General Thanksgiving? There were Puritans and Puritans, and from Cartwright to Baxter, there were those who were nearer to Hooker than Barrowe and Owen and the separatists. In a brief note on set forms of public prayer composed or employed by modern Nonconformist ministers Mr Matthews sums up, "There is more to be said for Hooker than our forefathers would concede." To the modern Anglican no conclusion could be more gratifying and, in view of the learning and standing of the author, more reassuring.

BRITFORD, WILTS. W. G. ADDISON.

HARRINGAY STORY. A detailed account of the Greater London Crusade, 1954. By Frank Colquhoun. Hodder and Stoughton. 10s. 6d.

Here is a tale of unbroken success. There are no ups and downs—no crises and no disasters—nothing but roses all the way, and for that reason I cannot recommend it as a story to be widely read. I was glad

to get near the end not only because the monotony had been hard to endure, but also because to my surprise the last ten pages were the best in the book. The "Final Reflections" in chapter twenty-one contain the author's genuine and dispassionate comments on Billy Graham's campaign, comments which he would readily endorse. He "did not please everybody"—"some disagreed violently with Graham's theology"—"he is well aware of his own shortcomings": this is in line with the picture thousands of us have in our minds of the man himself. A gifted young man with a fine presence who has dedicated his life to the service of our Lord and the preaching of the Gospel. Success and popularity have not spoiled him. He is still essentially humble and ready to learn, or he could not have served as a human link between many thousands of souls and their Saviour Christ, showing them and persuading them to take the first step and to make their "decisions" one by one. The first step, however necessary, is not the only one which counts, and no Christian should forget that this "decision" needs constant, even daily, renewal.

Billy Graham knows this well enough and tries to ensure that all his converts shall be put in touch with some church or chapel and be duly cared for, but perhaps they should be more frequently warned beforehand that they are in for a long-distance race and that no decision should be lightly made involving as it does the whole man, body, mind and spirit, for time and for eternity.

The churches owe him so much gratitude that criticism seems out of place, but the reviewer would remind you that it is the story and not the man of Harringay that disappoints him.

NON DIGNUS.

THE FOUNDATION AND EARLY YEARS OF QUEEN ANNE'S BOUNTY. By Alan Savidge. S.P.C.K. 15s.

Despite the painstaking and probably tedious research which has been involved in the production of this volume, Mr Savidge has not succeeded in writing a book which will have other than a limited appeal. No doubt he could have made the subject more "palatable" to the general reader by conjectures about the "back stairs" intrigue which, it might reasonably be inferred, preceded the introduction of the Bounty, but he has confined himself to the bare facts of the matter without unduly straining the interpretation of those facts, no matter how dull or uninteresting they may be.

The first part of the book deals with the circumstances surrounding the introduction of the Bounty, and the author admirably sums up the consequences of the abject poverty of many of the clergy. Quite obviously Burnet is his favourite for the "Bounty Stakes" although he is not unmindful of the fact that Burnet's Histories are largely eulogies of one Gilbert Burnet, and he thus redresses the balance by bringing Sharp into the picture and also quotes evidence which might well include Spelman and Harley within the orbit of clerical gratitude. The second part of the book, dealing with the fortunes of the Bounty during its formative years, is a little more

difficult to follow, but here it is not so much the author who is at fault as the confusion that apparently followed the inception of the scheme, making it difficult to trace out an intelligible line of development.

But Mr Savidge has accomplished what he set out to do—he has given an account of the beginnings and subsequent development of "Q.A.B.", and in his work he has had the advantage of being an official of the Bounty with access to the archives which have helped him to construct his thesis—even though at times his style of writing tends to become rather irritating and there are one or two minor errors in quotations.

J. F. WALKER.

DEWSBURY.

LIFE TO COME. By Stephen Hobhouse. Independent Press. 6s.

Stephen Hobhouse is a member of the Society of Friends. Aged seventy-two, infirm and confined to his room, he has just concluded a whole life of benevolent activities by an "enterprise in consolation"—the distribution of 10,000 greeting cards to homeless refugees in Germany. He now feels free to turn his thoughts to the life to come, and this "discourse" is the result. Largely dependent on the New Testament, it also makes great use of the mystics, especially Boehme and Sadhu Sundar Singh, the great hymn writers from Abelard to Whittier, the poets with special reference to Dante and William Blake, and a very cautious use of the fruits of psychical research.

The result is a little book of great beauty which should give much comfort to the aged and bereaved as well as edification to the general reader.

The idea of coinherence is much stressed, and it is odd that nowhere is there any reference to Charles Williams, who, one feels, would appreciate this book and in his novel *All Souls' Day* adumbrated much of its content.

One wishes that the author had not so frequently made use of the phrase "passed over", for which some of us have a possibly unreasonable dislike.

The deep charity and spiritual vision of the author react against theories of eternal torment and the picture given is universalist. In this connexion admirable quotations are made from Berdyaev and Soloviov, but even Berdyaev suggests that the logical possibility of Hell remains as a protection to human freedom, for man is free even to reject God eternally. One of the finest treatments of this subject was that of Prof. A. E. Taylor in his *Faith of a Moralist*, not quoted in this book. He concludes his great chapter on the Destiny of the Individual by saying that while he hoped that there were no men so diabolic as to merit perdition "there is just one man, of the many whom I have known, about whom I feel it is salutary not to be oversanguine, myself".

LEONARD M. SCHIFF.

BANGALORE.

THE TRAINING OF A SERVER. By Hylton Smith. Mowbrays. 3s. 6d.

Serving has too long been treated as a means of "holding" young men and boys who would otherwise be lost to the Church. This book restores it to its place as an important part of the liturgy, which is the offering of both priest and layman. The principles of serving are set out admirably in the first two chapters. The rest of the book is set out in the form of lessons for the server, which treat ceremony in a practical manner, neither slavishly English nor Western. The explanations given are simple and felicitous, and the whole is useful to any giving instruction in the Prayer Book rite. A server thus trained would be at home in most churches.

Those concerned with training servers would like to see a word on distractions involved in serving, which are often a stumbling block to the server. A generation that has grown accustomed to sitting for most of its time also needs assuring that it is possible, with practice, to kneel unsupported for five or ten minutes without undue hardship.

CAMBRIDGE. GEORGE BRAUND.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(Mention here neither implies nor precludes subsequent comment.)

A. AND C. BLACK: H. J. Cadbury, *The Book of Acts in History* (15s.).

CASTLE PRESS (WARWICK): *The Holy Communion at the Collegiate Church of St Mary the Virgin, Warwick* [the order of service with rubrical directions, the altar being in the centre of the church] (2s.).

CHRISTOPHER DAVIES: H. Idris Bell, *The Crisis of our Time, and Other Papers* (8s. 6d.).

DOUBLEDAY (NEW YORK): E. La B. Cherbonnier, *Hardness of Heart: a contemporary interpretation of the Christian doctrine of sin* ($2.95).

ÉDITIONS DU SEUIL: Paul Ricœur, *Histoire et Vérité* (600 frs.)

INDEPENDENT PRESS: John W. Grant, *Free Churchmanship in England, 1870–1940* (19s. 6d); H. Cunliffe-Jones (Ed.), *The Congregational Ministry in the Modern World* (8s. 6d.).

LONGMANS: Abbé Roger Poelman, *How to Read the Bible* (6s.); Harry Blamires, *Cold War in Hell* (10s. 6d.).

LUTTERWORTH PRESS: John C. Bennett, *The Christian as Citizen* [World Christian Books, No. 5] (2s.); Frank C. Laubach, *Channels of Spiritual Power* (8s. 6d.).

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS: Richard I. Aaron, *The True and the Valid* (3s. 6d.); *An Order for Holy Baptism* [authorized for experimental use in the Church of South India] (1s.).

S.C.M. PRESS: H. C. Whitley, *Blinded Eagle* (7s. 6d.); J. Burnaby (Trans.), *Augustine: Later Works* (30s.); Albert C. Oulter (Trans.), *Augustine: Confessions and Enchiridion* (30s.).

SHEED AND WARD: Albert Gelin, *The Key Concepts of the Old Testament* (6s.).

S.P.C.K.: *The Church and the Law of Nullity of Marriage* (6s.).

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY
BILLING AND SONS LTD.
GUILDFORD AND LONDON